



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/421,676	10/20/1999	BERNHARD GOTZ	964-991369	4487

7590 10/28/2002

WILLIAM H LOGSDON  
700 KOPPERS BUILDING  
436 SEVENTH AVENUE  
PITTSBURGH, PA 152191818

EXAMINER

LERNER, AVRAHAM H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3618

DATE MAILED: 10/28/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
09/421,676

Applicant(s)  
Bernhard Gotz

Examiner  
Avraham Lerner

Art Unit  
3618



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jul 22, 2002
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19, 21, and 22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19, 21, and 22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some\* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 3618

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. In view of the appeal brief filed on July 22, 2002, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. New ground of rejection are set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) request reinstatement of the appeal.

If reinstatement of the appeal is requested, such request must be accompanied by a supplemental appeal brief, but no new amendments, affidavits (37 CFR 1.130, 1.131 or 1.132) or other evidence are permitted. See 37 CFR 1.193(b)(2).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-19, 21, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Art Unit: 3618

The recitation added to each of the independent claims in the amendment of October 16, 2001, "a rear weight separate from the frame and connected to the frame" is unclear and indefinite in that the statement in itself is contradictory. An element can not be separate from a frame and connected to the same.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1, 7, 21, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wilkes, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,202,453).

Wilkes, Jr. et al. discloses an industrial truck comprising all elements as claimed, including a frame (14), a "rear weight" (body of power unit 12; see especially column 5, lines 39-43) connected to the frame; an internal combustion engine (ICE 38), wherein the ICE is mounted on the rear weight such that the rear weight is positioned between the engine and the frame such that vibrations from the engine are inherently transmitted from the engine to the rear weight and from the rear weight to the frame; and further including a hydraulic unit (see Fig. 7 and column 3 last paragraph) fastened to the ICE such that the hydraulic unit and ICE are mounted directly on the rear weight.

Art Unit: 3618

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 2-6 and 8-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilkes, Jr. et al. in view of Wakana et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,085,858).

Wilkes, Jr. et al. discloses a vehicle comprising all elements as claimed, as recited above in detail, with the exception of teaching elastic damping elements on ICE mounts which permit the engine to oscillate about a transverse axis, and a torque support that connects the ICE to the rear weight as claimed.

Wakana et al. discloses that it is known in the art to provide a vehicle with elastic damping elements on ICE mounts (e.g. 4a, 4b) which permit an engine (3) to oscillate about a transverse axis, and a torque support (6) that connects the ICE to the vehicle.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the vehicle of Wilkes, Jr. et al. with the engine orientation and mounting assembly of Wakana et al. in order to improve the operability of the mine service vehicle. Such a modification, as taught throughout Wakana et al. (see, for example, column 4, lines 4-5), would have provided the vehicle with improved idle vibration properties, and therefore would have

Art Unit: 3618

facilitated operating the vehicle and the attached crane of Wilkes, Jr. et al., while enhancing the drivability when a large torque is generated by the engine (column 4, lines 14-15). Note that although the two vehicles of the above patents appear dissimilar, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art, and in the instant case the benefits of utilizing the teachings of Wakana et al. would have been directly beneficial in the vehicle of Wilkes, Jr. et al. for the reasons cited above, and therefore such a modification would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

### ***Double Patenting***

8. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

Art Unit: 3618

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

9. Claim 21 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,454,034 B1. An obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but an examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim because the examined claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over the reference claims. See e.g. *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claim 21 is anticipated by claim 1 of the above U.S. Patent, which recites all elements as presently claimed.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

10. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-19, 21, and 22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Art Unit: 3618

*Conclusion*

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. (Warrender (U.S. Patent No. 3,721,318), Schaeff (U.S. Patent No. 4,502,709), Parsons (U.S. Patent No. 4,692,085), and Martin (U.S. Patent No. 5,152,658) disclose industrial trucks having rear counterweights connected to engine assemblies.

12. Applicant's amendment presented October 16, 2001 necessitated the new grounds of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a) and 1208.02. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.



Application/Control Number: 09/421676

Page 8

Art Unit: 3618

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Avraham Lerner whose telephone number is (703) 308-0423.

AVRAHAM LERNER  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

*A. Lerner 10/18/02*

October 18, 2002